

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment responds to the office action dated November 30, 2006.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-16, and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, contending that the limitation of “identifying is not based upon continuous dynamic programming” was not enabled by the specification. Similarly, the Examiner rejected each of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, contending that this limitation was indefinite. The applicant has amended each of independent claims 1, 5, 9, 15, and 21 to remove this limitation. Instead, each of these independent claims has been amended to specify that the step of identifying is based on an analysis that is performed without comparing characteristics of frames of sequences to be included in the summary to characteristics of frames of model sequences. This limitation is specifically disclosed at p. 4 line 28 to p. 5 line 3 and at p. 6 line 32 to p. 16 line 11. Moreover, each of these independent claims has been amended to recite that the segments included in the summary are identified by inferring the start of a play. This limitation is disclosed in the portions of the specification just cited, which discloses a number of methods, none of which actually detect the start of a play, such as a hike, but instead infer the hike based upon image characteristics of frames in candidate segments, such as camera angles, the direction of field lines, etc. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the respective 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of claims 1-7, 9-16, and 18-24.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-16, 18-22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being unpatentable over the article “Indexing of Baseball Telecast for Content-based Video Retrieval” by Kawashima et al. As amended, each of these claims patentably distinguishes over the cited reference because that reference specifically relies upon comparing sequences of frames in the video being summarized to model pitching sequences, so as to actually detect a pitch. As noted in the present application, this method is not only computationally inefficient, but also ineffective with respect to the game of football because the start of every play in football is not of a single type, and is not readily modeled. For example, the start of a play in football may be not only a hike sequence, but also a kick-off sequence in which the image characteristics would vary radically. Moreover, it is not feasible in football to detect the actual movement of the ball being hiked, except on a field goal, extra point, and a play starting in the shotgun formation.

Therefore each of claims 1-7, 9-16, and 18-24 patentably distinguish over Kawashima and, and the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of these claims based on this reference be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 9, 15, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Tamir, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,365. That reference merely discloses a video editing program whereby a user may manipulate video footage in specified ways. Each of claims 1, 5, 9, 15, and 21 have been amended to distinguish over Tamir by specifying that a computer performs the claimed step of identifying without manual input. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims based on this reference.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7, 9-16, and 18-24.

Respectfully submitted,



Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel: (503) 227-5631